CCNY-HEP-16/8
December 2016

Gauge-invariant Variables and the Entanglement Entropy

arXiv:1701.00014v2 [hep-th] 6 Feb 2017

Abhishek Agarwal[a], Dimitra Karabali[b] and V.P. Nair[c]

[a] *Physical Review Letters*
American Physical Society
Ridge, NY 11961

[b] *Department of Physics and Astronomy*
Lehman College of the CUNY
Bronx, NY 10468

[c] *Physics Department*
City College of the CUNY
New York, NY 10031

E-mail: abhishek@aps.org
dimitra.karabali@lehman.cuny.edu
vpnair@ccny.cuny.edu

Abstract

The entanglement entropy (EE) of gauge theories in three spacetime dimensions is analyzed using manifestly gauge-invariant variables. Specifically, we focus on the Maxwell, Maxwell-Chern-Simons (MCS), Maxwell-Higgs and nonabelian Yang-Mills theories. Special attention is paid to the analysis of the bulk and edge modes and their interplay with the Gauss law constraint. EE is computed exactly (including the topological contribution in the MCS case) for all the abelian models considered in the paper and the effect of mass gaps on the EE is explicitly studied for the massive case. The same quantity is also computed in a gauge-invariant gaussian approximation applied to the nonabelian theory. The approximation is sensitive to the dynamically generated mass gap, whose effect on EE is also analyzed. The specific prescription for computing EE developed and employed in this work does not produce a contact term and our approach is compared and contrasted with the replica method applied to gauge theories.

1 Introduction and Summary

In this paper we formulate a gauge invariant set up for computing the entropy of vacuum entanglement (EE) for gauge theories in three spacetime dimensions within a Hamiltonian approach defined directly in the continuum. We use this approach to compute the EE for several models, with a special emphasis on massive gauge theories. Specifically, we consider the EE for the abelian Maxwell, Maxwell-Chern-Simons (MCS) and Higgsed Maxwell theories. We also consider nonabelian Yang-Mills theory for which we are able to find a tractable regime where the EE can be computed, albeit approximately. The approximation employed for the nonabelian theory is manifestly gauge invariant and it allows us to explicitly study the effect of the nonperturbative mass-gap of the purely gluonic theory on its EE. We focus on "half-space" entanglement for purposes of comparing our results with other computational techniques - though our procedure can be straightforwardly generalized to more involved geometries, such as with disconnected subregions - and we find that our prescription does not produce a contact term.

Quantifying the information content of gauge theory vacua has recently emerged as an interesting computational as well as a conceptual challenge. While it can be argued - in analogy with finite dimensional quantum mechanical models - that EE, defined as the von Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrix ρ_{red} is a reasonable measure of the ground state entanglement of any field theory, its definition and computation are far from obvious in a gauge theory. In a typical field theory without gauge symmetries (e.g a free scalar theory) the Hamiltonian is a local operator acting on local physical degrees of freedom that span the Hilbert space. Thus, there is no conceptual obstruction to integrating out degrees of freedom for the "inside" region (or the "outside" region) to obtain a reduced density matrix for the complementary region. This can be done just as one would in a system of coupled oscillators, and this was indeed the approach taken in the early computations of EE for scalar field theories [1]. There are several obstructions to straightforwardly applying this approach directly to gauge theories, where the obvious physical degrees of freedom are non-local Wilson loops which can prevent a clean separation of the Hilbert space into "inside" and "outside" regions. Further, [1] used an explicit position space representation of the vacuum wave functional Ψ for the scalar theory. Our explicit knowledge of gauge invariant Ψ's is limited at best for gauge theories.

Several different approaches to circumvent these issues have recently been explored. One could conceive defining and computing EE on a lattice [2]. Though the lattice allows one to compute using quasi-local link and plaquette variables, the constraint of gauge invariance does involve different local degrees of freedom. This leads to several prescriptions for "cutting" the lattice into "inside" and "outside" regions and they may lead to inequivalent expressions for EE (see [3] for a computation explicitly devoted to these issues for the Maxwell theory in $D = 2 + 1$). Further, the topological Chern-Simons term or nonlocal parity conserving mass terms (we study a particular variant of the latter in this paper) are difficult to realize on the lattice. An alternative method, the replica trick, allows one to work directly in the

continuum and it circumvents the problem of explicitly computing Ψ by formally expressing it as an Euclidean path integral with specific boundary conditions at the initial and final time slices [4, 5].[1] The α-th power of ρ_{red} is formally expressed as a path integral over a cone using the replica method. However, a rigorous proof of equivalence of the entropy computed from the cone partition function (S_{cone}) with EE (as computed from an explicit construction of Ψ) is lacking for gauge theories.[2] In a beautiful paper, Kabat [7] computed S_{cone} for Maxwell fields which have $D-2$ physical degrees of freedom. The computation in [7] showed that S_{cone} differed from the EE of $D-2$ scalar fields by an additional negative contribution; the so called contact term. The contact term and its possible physical interpretation has been explored recently [8, 9], however it is is not completely clear if it arises in computations of EE entirely within a Hamiltonian formulation [9]. One is thus motivated to analyze the EE starting from an explicit gauge invariant description of Ψ for gauge theories directly in the continuum. While such a construction is generally out of reach in $D = 3+1$, a gauge invariant Hamiltonian prescription developed in [10] does enable us to carry out such an analysis in $D = 2+1$. This is the main focus of this paper.

For purposes of computing "half-space" entanglement between two regions I and II, our strategy is to decompose the Hamiltonian of the theory defined in $\mathrm{I}\bigcup\mathrm{II}$ such that we have a manifestly gauge invariant Hamiltonian formulation of the theory individually in I and II. This requirement naturally dictates the inclusion of chiral edge modes on the entangling surface when a Chern-Simons term is included to compensate for the ensuing gauge anomaly. We then "glue" the regions together by continuing the gauge invariant bulk modes in I and II into $\mathrm{I}\bigcup\mathrm{II}$ and identify the chiral edge modes by the insertion of suitable functional delta functions. We also discuss another class of possible edge modes [11] which can arise at the boundary of $\mathrm{I}\bigcup\mathrm{II}$ due to gauge transformations that do not vanish at spatial infinity. These modes can, in principle, also be present at the entangling surface when one constructs gauge invariant dynamics in I and II separately. However, Gauss' law removes these modes from the entangling surface, since it is not a physical boundary, while the modes at the boundary of $\mathrm{I}\bigcup\mathrm{II}$ do not contribute to EE. Nevertheless, we construct the explicit Hamiltonians for such edge modes and show (without restricting ourselves to any specific geometry) that they arise entirely due to gauge transformations that do not vanish at spatial infinity. In other words, transformations which go to the identity (i.e., with vanishing gauge parameter) at spatial infinity are true gauge transformations and get factored out, while those which do not go to the identity generate physical degrees of freedom. Although physical, such degrees of freedom can be ignored for purposes of EE computations within our framework. Following on, we explicitly construct the vacuum wave functional Ψ for the bulk modes (in $\mathrm{I}\bigcup\mathrm{II}$) and the chiral edge modes across the entanglement cut. Ψ, expressed in terms of manifestly gauge invariant variables is the starting point for our EE computations. We use the gauge invariant Ψ to compute the trace of

[1] Some subtleties in the use of replica trick for EE for gauge theories have been discussed in [6].

[2] However S_{cone} is interesting in its own right as it computes the one-loop correction to the Bekenstein-Hawking entropy of a black hole.

ρ_{red} by expressing the latter as a conical partition function that employs only gauge invariant variables. There is a subtlety that differentiates the above method from the usual replica-trick constructions [5] for gauge fields that is worth commenting on. In the conventional replica method one separates the gauge invariant variables (the transverse component of A_μ) $after$ expressing the EE as a conical partition function in terms of the gauge covariant variables A_μ. In our approach, we express the wave functional in terms of gauge invariant variables on each replica $before$ iterating the process to express the trace of ρ_{red} as a thermal partition function on a cone. The difference from the two orders of doing these operations is precisely the contact term. It should be borne in mind that the techniques used in this paper are special to $D = 2+1$ and they do not address the status of the contact term in other spacetime dimensions.

In the case of the Abelian Maxwell theory, the gauge invariant wave functional as well as the associated EE is the same as that of a single massless scalar within our framework. For the MCS theory, we have a bulk contribution - described by a massive scalar $m = \frac{e^2 k}{4\pi}$ and the gapped chiral edge modes. The associated EE receives contributions proportional to the "area" of the entangling surface from the bulk modes, while the edge modes contribute the topological term $\sim \frac{1}{2}\ln k$, where k is the level number and e is the electric charge. As part of this computation, we explicitly describe the separation of the bulk and edge gauge invariant degrees of freedom within a Hamiltonian framework. We also consider a massive deformation of Maxwell theory equivalent to adding a parity, Lorentz and gauge-invariant mass term of the form $\sim \frac{m^2}{2}\int A^\mu \left(\delta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\partial_\mu\partial_\nu}{\Box}\right) A^\nu$. Such a mass term can arise when one considers a Higgsed Maxwell theory where the Goldstone mode has been explicitly integrated out and the mass of the Higgs scalar is much larger than e^2. The Hamiltonian analysis, we argue, produces a wave functional of a single massive scalar field. (The analysis is equivalent to eliminating the scalar modes that the Higgs mechanism at the level of wave functionals.) However, the absence of a gauge anomaly leads to an absence of topological terms in the EE for this theory. Finally, we also consider nonabelian $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theory. Unlike the cases of the other models discussed in this paper, we are unable to compute EE in the nonabelian case exactly (this is expected as the theory is not known to be exactly solvable). However, we use the formulation due to [10] to obtain a gauge invariant truncation of the vacuum wave-functional of the gauge theory. This tractable regime allows us to work with a Gaussian wave functional which, nevertheless, retains information about the nonperturbative mass-gap of this theory. Specifically, we find that the mass-gap leads to a finite (and hence universal) term in the EE which is proportional to the area of the entangling surface. Interestingly, its contribution is negative, leading to a reduction in entanglement and provides a direct potential link between the IR properties of the gauge theory and EE. Although our chief reliance remains on Hamiltonian methods, we also provide alternate derivations of the wave-functionals for the various models used using other techniques to underscore the connections to other approaches to EE used in the recent literature.

This paper is organized as follows. After collating and reviewing some basic results for half-space entanglement for the massive scalar field in three spacetime dimensions we analyze

the case of Maxwell theory in $D = 2+1$ in some detail. We pay special attention to the gauge invariant formulation of EE for this theory and implementation of the Gauss law constraint. The latter is closely connected to the role of edge states for the theory which we analyze within our framework as well. This is followed by a self-contained analysis of Maxwell-Chern-Simons (MCS) theory. We formulate "gluing" MCS theories defined in two spatial regions within a gauge-invariant framework and address the roles of edge modes generated by the bulk as well as the chiral edge degrees of freedom. We show how the topological Chern-Simons contribution decouples from the bulk modes and compute the EE for the massive gauge theory exactly. The following section is devoted to the study of the abelian Maxwell theory rendered massive by the Higgs mechanism and by the addition of a nonlocal parity conserving mass term. We show how these two mechanisms of endowing the three dimensional photon with a mass are related to each other and compute EE for both theories. We study the nonabelian pure-glue theory in the penultimate section where we compute its EE in a gauge invariant Gaussian approximation that accommodates the effect of the nonperturbative mass gap. We use this computation to provide some evidence for a direct connection between IR phenomena in gauge theories such as confinement, and the behavior of EE. In the final section we comment on some subtle differences between our approach and the usual replica-trick methods and present some observations that might account for the absence of the contact term in our computations.

2 The entanglement entropy of a massive scalar field

Since many of the cases we discuss will utilize the EE of a massive scalar field, we start by briefly recalling how such a computation is carried out; for more details, see [5]. With a standard action given by

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x \left[(\partial\phi)^2 - m^2\phi^2\right] \tag{1}$$

the ground state (or vacuum) wave function is given by

$$\Psi[\varphi] = \mathcal{N}\, \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\int d^2x\, d^2y\ \varphi(x)\,(\sqrt{m^2-\nabla^2})_{x,y}\,\varphi(y)\right) \tag{2}$$

where φ denotes the value of the field at a given time-slice, say, at $t = 0$. We can now apply the replica trick to the wave function. The first step involves giving (2) a path integral representation as [5]

$$\Psi[\varphi] = \int [\mathcal{D}\phi']\delta(\phi'(x_i, t=0) - \varphi)\ e^{-\int\left[\frac{1}{2}\phi'(p^2+m^2)\phi'\right]} \tag{3}$$

where we integrate over all fields from $t = -\infty$ to $t = 0$. Here we are using the Euclidean action, t for this expression being the Euclidean time variable. We simply regard the above as a mathematical representation of the wave functional without ascribing any fundamental meaning to the three-dimensional action appearing in the functional integral on the right hand side. Repeating this construction α times and integrating the degrees of freedom on the

negative x-axis (out of the density matrix constructed from the wave function) reduces the EE computation to the evaluation of a functional integral for a massive scalar field on a cone with deficit angle $2\pi(1-\alpha)$ [5]. More precisely, the EE can be defined as

$$S_E = (\alpha\partial_\alpha - 1)W_\alpha. \tag{4}$$

where, W_α is the effective action on the cone, defined in terms of the heat kernel $K(s) = e^{-s(p^2+m^2)}$ as

$$W_\alpha = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\epsilon^2}^{\infty} \mathrm{tr}K(s) \tag{5}$$

Using known techniques, we evaluate the conical partition function and express the entropy as

$$S_E(m) = \frac{2\pi\mathbb{A}}{6}\int_{\epsilon^2}^{\infty}\frac{ds}{(4\pi s)^{d/2}}e^{-m^2 s} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathbb{A}, \epsilon$ are the entangling area and UV cutoff respectively. This expression is written for any spacetime dimension d; more concretely, for $d = 3$, we get

$$S_E(m) = \frac{\mathbb{A}}{12\sqrt{\pi}}\left(\frac{e^{-\epsilon^2 m^2}}{\epsilon} - m\sqrt{\pi}\,\mathrm{erfc}(\epsilon m)\right) \tag{7}$$

In the above expression, $\mathrm{erfc}(x)$ is the complementary error function; $1-\mathrm{erf}(x)$. It is instructive to expand (7) in powers of the UV cutoff ϵ as

$$S_E(m) = \frac{\mathbb{A}}{12\sqrt{\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - m\sqrt{\pi} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\right) \tag{8}$$

The leading term here is the EE of a massless scalar field, which is proportional to the area of the entangling surface and is cut-off dependent. There is also a finite term proportional to the mass. This may be unambiguously extracted by taking the $\epsilon \to 0$ limit of $S_E(m) - S_E(0)$. Notice also that the mass correction tends to decrease the entanglement entropy. Since correlators are of short range ($\sim 1/m$) in a massive theory, we may expect the entanglement to be reduced, in agreement with (8).

We now turn to the gauge theories.

3 Gauge-invariant Hamiltonian framework for entanglement

3.1 The Maxwell theory

Our approach, as mentioned in the introduction, is to cast the gauge theory entirely in terms of gauge-invariant variables and use it to calculate the entanglement entropy.

We will start with the Maxwell theory on a disc D with a boundary. Our eventual goal is to consider the whole plane, so the boundary should not be of significance. But we will start with a disc with a boundary because the analysis of gauge invariant modes for this case has

been carried out in Balachandran *et al* [11], who also identified the edge modes. Since our way of introducing the gauge-invariant variables is slightly different from [11], we want to ensure that our formalism is consistent with it. This will also help to settle the question of whether the edge modes found in [11] have any implications for the entropy calculation.

As in most Hamiltonian analyses, we will use the gauge $A_0 = 0$. Then we solve the Gauss law condition to obtain the properly reduced canonical formulation. In two dimensions, the spatial components A_i have the general parametrization

$$A_i = \partial_i \theta + \epsilon_{ij} \partial_j \phi \tag{9}$$

so that the electric field is given by

$$E_i = \dot{A}_i = \partial_i \dot{\theta} + \epsilon_{ij} \partial_j \dot{\phi} \tag{10}$$

The Gauss law takes the form

$$\nabla \cdot E = \nabla^2 \dot{\theta} = 0 \tag{11}$$

The solution of the Gauss law for this case proceeds as follows. We choose a value for $\dot{\theta}$ on the boundary, say, α, and write

$$\dot{\theta}(x) = \oint \alpha(y)\, n \cdot \partial_y G(y, x) \tag{12}$$

where $G(y, x)$ is the Green's function for the Laplacian with Dirichlet boundary conditions and n_i denotes the unit vector normal to the boundary [12]. It is easy to show this result using Green's theorem. Equation (12) gives $\dot{\theta}$ everywhere in the interior of the disc. We will now simplify the action $S = \frac{1}{2}\int (E^2 - B^2)$. The kinetic term becomes

$$\frac{1}{2}\int d^3x\ E^2 = \frac{1}{2}\int \left[(\nabla\dot{\theta})^2 + 2\,(\partial_i \dot{\theta}\, \partial_j \dot{\phi}\, \epsilon_{ij}) + (\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 \right] \tag{13}$$

The boundary condition for the field ϕ used in [11] is

$$n_i\, \epsilon_{ij} \partial_j \phi = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial D, \tag{14}$$

Thus the tangential derivative of ϕ is taken to vanish; in a mode expansion of the field, this will be equivalent to taking $\phi = 0$ on ∂D. The boundary condition justified in [11] by consideration of the self-adjointness of the differential operator appearing in the potential energy term in the Hamiltonian. We will discuss this issue in more detail later, but for now, accepting (14), the cross term in (13) is seen to vanish and hence the action becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{2}\int (\nabla\dot{\theta})^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int (\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - \frac{1}{2}\int (\nabla^2\phi)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\oint \alpha(x)\, M(x,y)\, \alpha(y) + \frac{1}{2}\int \left[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (\nabla^2\phi)^2 \right] \qquad (15) \\ M(x,y) &= n \cdot \partial_x\, n \cdot \partial_y G(x,y) \qquad (16) \end{aligned}$$

We see that the action has modes with $\nabla^2\phi \neq 0$, which may be taken to be expanded in terms of modes obeying

$$-\nabla^2 u_n = \omega_n^2 u_n \tag{17}$$

with $u_n = 0$ on ∂D. Notice that there are no modes with $\omega_n^2 = 0$, because there are no nontrivial solutions to $\nabla^2 u_n = 0$ with the chosen boundary condition. In addition, we have modes on the boundary which come from $\alpha = \dot{\theta}$.

The variation of the time-derivative terms in (15) leads to the canonical one-form

$$\mathcal{A} = \oint \alpha(x)\, M(x,y)\, \delta\theta(y) + \int d^2x\ \partial_i\dot{\phi}\ \partial_i\delta\phi \tag{18}$$

The Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}\int d^2x\ \left[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 + (\nabla^2\phi)^2\right] + \frac{1}{2}\oint \alpha(x)\, M(x,y)\, \alpha(y) \tag{19}$$

The canonical structure (18) shows that α is conjugate to the value of θ on the boundary, modulo the invertible kernel $M(x,y)$. Further $\alpha(x)$'s commute among themselves, $[\alpha(x), \alpha(y)] = 0$. The Hamiltonian has no terms which depend on θ, so the α-dependent term in the Hamiltonian is like a free particle kinetic energy term and gives continuous eigenvalues. These are the edge modes for the pure Maxwell theory discussed in [11].

As for the ϕ-fields, we can write

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^2x\ \partial_i\delta\phi\, \partial_i\dot{\phi} = \int d^2x\ \delta\phi\, (-\nabla^2)\dot{\phi} = \int d^2x\ \delta\phi\, \dot{B} \tag{20}$$

This identifies $\dot{B} = -\nabla^2\dot{\phi}$ as the momentum conjugate to ϕ. We are interested in calculating the ground state wave function from this. If we ignore the modes due to α, the Hamiltonian is

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}\int \left[-\frac{\delta}{\delta B}(-\nabla^2)\frac{\delta}{\delta B} + B^2\right] \tag{21}$$

The ground state wave function is thus

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_0 &= \mathcal{N}\ \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int_{x,y} B(x)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{-\nabla^2}}\right)_{x,y} B(y)\right] \\ &= \mathcal{N}\ \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int_{x,y} \partial_i\phi(x)\left(-\nabla^2\right)^{1/2}_{x,y}\partial_i\phi(y)\right]\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Here $\mathcal{N}$ is a normalization constant.

Now we consider all of space, which we may consider as a large disc, with its radius eventually going to ∞. We want to split the space into two regions, labeled I and II, with a boundary between the two. Let us take I as the inner region (of roughly circular shape) and II as the outer region. The boundary between the two is an imaginary one, entirely contained inside the disc. The edge modes due to α reside at the outer boundary whose radius tends to

∞ and, since the α-part of the Hamiltonian decouples from the rest, it is not affected by the splitting of the interior of the disc into two regions. Thus we may choose to set $\alpha = 0$ for the calculation of the entanglement entropy; it can thus be carried out using the wave function (22). Notice that this wave function looks very much like the wave function for a massless scalar field. In fact, we can transform exactly to the scalar field form by defining $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$; the wave function (22) then becomes

$$\Psi_0 = \mathcal{N}\ \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int_{x,y}\varphi(x)\left(-\nabla^2\right)^{1/2}_{x,y}\varphi(y)\right] \tag{23}$$

If we now consider defining $\varphi_{\rm I}$ and $\varphi_{\rm II}$ in the two regions I and II, the calculation of the reduced density matrix and the EE becomes identical to that for a scalar field. However, before we can come to this conclusion, we need to ask the question: When we consider the disc as made of the two regions I and II (with an interface ∂I or ∂II) and integrate over the fields in one region to get the reduced density matrix, which is the "correct" field variable to use, ϕ or φ? To understand this in some detail, consider parametrizing the field ϕ in region I as follows.

$$\phi_{\rm I} = \eta_{\rm I} + \oint \chi(y)\, n\cdot\partial_y G(y,x)_{\rm I}, \qquad \dot\phi_{\rm I} = \dot\eta_{\rm I} + \oint \dot\chi(y)\, n\cdot\partial_y G(y,x)_{\rm I} \tag{24}$$

where η obeys Dirichlet conditions on the interface and χ is the value of ϕ on the interface. Basically, we have taken χ as the value of $\phi_{\rm I}$ on the interface and continued it into the interior of region I such that it obeys the Laplace equation. The rest of the functional degrees of freedom are represented by $\eta_{\rm I}$, which may be taken to vanish on the interface as the value of $\phi_{\rm I}$ there is already captured by χ. A complete parametrization of field values in region I is thus given by (24). A similar parametrization can be done for region II as well. Upon substituting (24) into the action, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\int(\nabla\dot\phi)^2 &= \int(\nabla\dot\eta)^2 + \int 2\,(\nabla\dot\chi)\cdot(\nabla\dot\eta) + \int(\nabla\dot\chi)^2 \\ &= \int(\nabla\dot\eta)^2 + \oint \dot\chi(x)\, M(x,y)\,\dot\chi(y)\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where we used the fact that $\nabla^2\oint_y \chi(y)\, n\cdot\partial_y G(y,x)_{\rm I} = 0$, and that $\eta_{\rm I}$ vanishes on ∂I, so that the cross term integrates to zero. A similar separation happens in all terms in the action, for both regions. As a result, the action becomes

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S_{\rm I} + S_{\rm II} + S_{\partial{\rm I}} \\ S_{\rm I} &= \frac{1}{2}\int\left[(\nabla\dot\eta_{\rm I})^2 - (-\nabla^2\eta_{\rm I})^2\right] \\ S_{\partial{\rm I}} &= \frac{1}{2}\oint \dot\chi(x)\left(M(x,y)_{\rm I} + M(x,y)_{\rm II}\right)\dot\chi(y)\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The expression for $S_{\rm II}$ is similar to $S_{\rm I}$ and the action on the interface has similar contributions from both regions I and II; i.e.,

$$M(x,y)_{\rm I} = n\cdot\partial_x\, n\cdot\partial_y\, G(x,y)_{\rm I}, \qquad M(x,y)_{\rm II} = n\cdot\partial_x\, n\cdot\partial_y\, G(x,y)_{\rm II} \tag{27}$$

If we now carry out the canonical quantization of the action in the split form (26) and find the ground state wave functions, there is no mixing between the various field variables $\eta_{\rm I}$, $\eta_{\rm II}$ or χ; we have independent theories for $\eta_{\rm I}$, $\eta_{\rm II}$ and χ, with $\Psi_0 = \Psi_0(\eta_{\rm I})\,\Psi_0(\eta_{\rm II})\,\Psi_0(\chi)$. As a result, we have a puzzle as to how we can see entanglement effects. The solution has to do with the choice of field variables and the commutation rules. We have to first identify the sources of entanglement and how they affect the choice of the field variables we use. Going back to the Maxwell theory, consider the commutation rules following from the action (15). In terms of ϕ, we have

$$[\phi(x),\, \dot{\phi}(y)] = i\, G(y,x) \tag{28}$$

If we split the ϕ variables into two regions, say, regions I and II, with the corresponding $\phi_{\rm I}$ and $\phi_{\rm II}$, then this commutation rule tells us that there is some entanglement since $[\phi_{\rm I}, \dot{\phi}_{\rm II}] \neq 0$ due to the nonlocality of the Green's function; there is an uncertainty principle for simultaneous measurements of ϕ and $\dot{\phi}$ for far separated regions. This is true irrespective of which state of the system (or wave function) we choose. Thus, in the case where we are able to separate the action into the three pieces as in (26) with no mixing between the different terms, the entanglement arises from the fact that the commutation rule does not allow a simple splitting into distinct regions. (This can be seen even in terms of the split form (26), provided we recognize that observables can connect different regions through χ.)

More generally, entanglement can arise from the commutation rules or from the wave functions. The relative contributions of these two sources will vary depending on the choice of field variables. For example, we could choose B as the basic variable. Then the commutation rules will be local. However, the wave functions for this choice will involve nonlocal operators and lead to entanglement. Likewise, we can choose $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$ as the field variable, defined over the entire plane before we do the separation into the two regions I and II. This will give local commutation rules, so there will be no reason to expect entanglement effects via the commutation rules, but the wave function will contain the nonlocal kernel $\sqrt{-\nabla^2}$ as in (23) and that will lead to entanglement.

There is yet another facet to this problem. The measure of integration for gauge fields is the volume element on the space of gauge potentials (which we will denote by $\mathcal{P}$) modulo gauge transformations (which are elements of $\mathcal{G}_*$). We can obtain this in terms of our variables by considering the metric

$$ds^2 = \int d^2x\ \delta\phi(-\nabla^2)\delta\phi\ +\ \delta\theta(-\nabla^2)\delta\theta \tag{29}$$

The volume element corresponding to this is

$$d\mu = \sqrt{\det(-\nabla^2)}\prod_x d\phi(x) \times \sqrt{\det(-\nabla^2)}\prod_x d\theta(x) \tag{30}$$

Since the wave functions do not involve θ, we are primarily interested in the ϕ-part of the measure. For this, because of the nonlocality of the $\det(-\nabla^2)$, it does not factorize into

integrations over $\phi_{\rm I}$ and $\phi_{\rm II}$. However, if we define $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$, we can write

$$d\mu = \prod_x d\varphi(x) \times \sqrt{\det(-\nabla^2)} \prod_x d\theta(x) \tag{31}$$

The part depending on φ does factorize into integrations over variables in regions I and II. As for the θ-part, since we are integrating over the gauge invariant variables, the integration should correspond to $\mathcal{P}/\mathcal{G}_*$ and is given by

$$d\mu = \prod_x d\varphi(x) \times \sqrt{\det(-\nabla^2)} \tag{32}$$

There is an additional determinant from the θ-part. This is because $d\mu(\mathcal{G}_*) = \prod_x d\theta(x)$; only this factor corresponding to the product of the $d\theta$'s is dropped upon modding out the gauge transformations. However, the wave functions do not depend on θ and we do not have to consider splitting any θ-integrations into the two regions, so this factor $\sqrt{\det(-\nabla^2)}$ does not have to be split; in fact, it can be eliminated by the proper normalization of the wave function for the whole plane.

The lesson from the nonseparability of the commutation rules and the integration measure can be phrased as follows. The simplest strategy for entanglement considerations is to choose field variables such that the commutation rules are local; equivalently, for a general symplectic form Ω, we must choose variables such that Ω^{-1} is local. Then we work out the wave function and consider separating the field variables into those defined on each region.

Returning to the case of the Maxwell theory, this strategy means that the field variable which is most convenient is

$$\varphi = \int_y (\sqrt{-\nabla^2})_{x,y}\, \phi(y) \tag{33}$$

In terms of this variable, the action for the Maxwell theory, after dropping the boundary terms at spatial infinity, is

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int \left[\dot{\varphi}^2 - (\partial_i \varphi)^2\right] \tag{34}$$

We see that this does lead to local commutation rules for the variables φ, $\dot{\varphi}$. The Hamiltonian will be that of a massless scalar field with the ground state wave function given by (23). The integration measure is also local in terms of φ. The problem has thus been reduced to the case of a scalar field.

Returning to the main thread of logic, taking the gauge invariant wave function (23) as the starting point, we can compute the reduced density matrix and the ensuing entropy of entanglement. From the known results on the study of the scalar field [4, 5], we can in fact read off the entanglement entropy for the Maxwell case (we will expand on the computational details in more general context shortly) to be

$$S_E = \frac{\mathbb{A}}{12\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\right) \tag{35}$$

where ϵ is the UV cutoff and $\mathbb{A}$ is the "area" of the entangling surface. (In 2+1 dimensions, this is just the length of the entangling surface.) It is important to note that once one starts with the gauge-invariant wave functional as above, the resulting entanglement entropy does not have a contact term. The conical partition function of the gauge field in three dimensions should be interpreted as a somewhat different quantity. We shall comment on this issue later.

We close this section with a few remarks relevant to completing this part of the story. First, we consider why ϕ can be taken to vanish on the boundary ∂D. This comes from the self-adjointness of the potential energy term. Writing it as a quadratic form, we need

$$\int (\nabla^2\phi)^2 = \int \phi\ (\nabla^2\,\nabla^2\phi) \tag{36}$$

For this equality, we need the condition

$$\oint \partial_n\phi\,(\nabla^2\phi)\,dS - \oint \phi\,(\nabla^2\partial_n\phi)\,dS = 0 \tag{37}$$

There are many ways to implement this condition. We can take $n\cdot\partial\phi$ and $\nabla^2(n\cdot\partial\phi)$ to vanish, or ϕ and $\nabla^2\phi$ (and the tangential derivative) to vanish on ∂D. As mentioned earlier, we have made the latter choice; this was also the choice in [11]. This is consistent with the tangential derivative vanishing as in (14) and leads to the expansion in terms of the modes defined in (17).

A second question is about the parametrization (9) for A_i. Notice that the field ϕ is defined only up to a constant, since A_i involves the derivative of ϕ. We may consider the transformation $\phi \to (\phi + \text{constant})$ as a new kind of gauge symmetry. The wave function (22) is invariant for this transformation as well. By choosing ϕ to vanish on ∂D, we have done a "gauge fixing" for this symmetry. It should be understood that the definition of φ in (33) is with this "gauge-fixed" ϕ.

Finally, we turn to the question of the meaning of the modes generated by α. These are physical modes and the reason for that is because we only enforce the Gauss law with test functions which vanish at the boundary. So modes generated by gauge transformations which do not vanish at the boundary are not true gauge modes, but are physical. Under a gauge transformation with test function $f(x)$, $\theta \to \theta + f$, so the value of θ on the boundary is gauge-invariant since $f \to 0$ on the boundary. The canonical one-form including the nonzero value of θ at the boundary is

$$\mathcal{A} = \int (-\nabla^2\dot{\phi})\,\delta\phi \ + \ \oint \alpha(x)\,M(x,y)\,\delta\theta \tag{38}$$

We see that $M\alpha$ is conjugate to θ on the boundary; $M\alpha$ and θ form a canonical pair of physical variables. The Hamiltonian for the Maxwell theory involves only α; one can use an α-diagonal representation for the wave functions. In particular, $\alpha = 0$ state would have the lowest energy.

Consider now the situation where we think of the spatial manifold as consisting of the two regions I and II, with a common boundary for them. We do get additional boundary (α, θ)

modes when we think of splitting the space into two physical regions which are to be glued together. The gluing procedure requires implementing Gauss law across the entangling surface which can be used to eliminate the additional α and θ modes. Requiring Gauss law for test functions which do not vanish on this interface effectively turns the boundary between the two regions into a virtual interface and not a real boundary. We can see how this leads to the elimination of the edge modes more explicitly as follows.

Gauss law in each region requires a matching condition at the interface when we put them together to form the full space. This is the continuity of the normal component of the electric field, $n \cdot \partial\dot{\theta}_{\rm I} = n \cdot \partial\dot{\theta}_{\rm II}$. In terms of α this reads

$$\int_{\partial {\rm I}} \alpha_{\rm I}(y)\, M(x,y)_{\rm I} = -\int_{\partial {\rm II}} \alpha_{\rm II}(y)\, M(x,y)_{\rm II} \tag{39}$$

where the minus sign arises due to the orientation of the boundary. Further we have continuity of θ, so that the constraints are

$$\theta_{\rm I} - \theta_{\rm II} \sim 0, \qquad \Pi_{\theta_{\rm I}} + \Pi_{\theta_{\rm II}} \sim 0 \tag{40}$$

where Π_θ denotes $M\,\alpha$, the canonical momentum for θ. These constraints are first class, so we can choose the corresponding conjugate constraints

$$\theta_{\rm I} + \theta_{\rm II} \sim 0, \qquad \Pi_{\theta_{\rm I}} - \Pi_{\theta_{\rm II}} \sim 0 \tag{41}$$

so that the quartet $(\theta_{\rm I}, \Pi_{\theta_{\rm I}}, \theta_{\rm II}, \Pi_{\theta_{\rm II}})$ will together get eliminated upon Hamiltonian reduction. In this situation, the electric field $E_i = \partial_i\dot{\theta} + \epsilon_{ij}\partial_j\dot{\phi} = \epsilon_{ij}\partial_j\dot{\phi}$ on the interface, since we eliminate α (or $\dot{\theta}$). On the interface, we then have conjugate degrees of freedom due to $\dot{\phi}$ as part of the electric field and $-\nabla^2\phi$ as part of the magnetic field. In the lattice-based analysis in [3], three choices based on how much of the electric field link variables are eliminated on the interface are presented. The existence of conjugate electric and magnetic field variables in our case, suggests that our approach given above is the trivial center case of [3].

The procedure we have outlined on how α, θ get eliminated is relevant because the theory on the full space can be considered as being built up from the theories defined in each region with suitable matching conditions. This latter point of view will be important for the Maxwell-Chern-Simons case and this brings the discussion of the Maxwell theory in line with the analysis to follow.

3.2 The Maxwell-Chern-Simons theory

We shall now consider a similar analysis for the Maxwell-Chern-Simons (MCS) theory starting with the case of a disc with a boundary and identify the edge modes. This is again for comparison with [11] and to argue that the edge modes will not be relevant for the entanglement issue. The action is given by

$$S = \int d^3x \ \left[\frac{1}{2}(E^2 - B^2) + \frac{ke^2}{4\pi}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha}A_\mu\partial_\nu A_\alpha\right] \tag{42}$$

where e is the coupling constant. While the Maxwell term is manifestly gauge invariant, the Chern-Simons (CS) term changes by a boundary term upon carrying out a gauge transformation. This boundary term will have a contribution involving the spatial boundary and two terms on the initial and final time-slices which results from the time-integration. The latter terms will be part of the Gauss law of the theory. We will consider only gauge transformations which go to the identity at the spatial boundary, so that the term on the spatial boundary vanishes and the CS term can be taken to be gauge invariant. As before, we proceed by choosing the $A_0 = 0$ condition. The action then reduces to

$$S = \int d^3x \ \left[\frac{\dot{A}_i^2}{2} - \frac{B^2}{2} - \frac{ke^2}{4\pi} \epsilon^{ij} A_i \partial_0 A_j \right] \tag{43}$$

Once again, we introduce the parametrization $A_i = \partial_i \theta + \epsilon_{ij} \partial_j \phi$. Since we chose the $A_0 = 0$ condition, the action (43) must be supplemented by the Gauss law which is given as

$$\nabla \cdot E + \frac{ke^2}{2\pi} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i A_j = \nabla^2 \left(\dot{\theta} - m\, \phi \right) = 0 \tag{44}$$

where $m = \frac{ke^2}{2\pi}$. Substituting the parametrization for A_i into the action, it simplifies as

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \frac{1}{2} \int (\nabla \dot{\theta})^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int (\nabla \dot{\phi})^2 - \frac{1}{2} \int (\nabla^2 \phi)^2 - m \int (-\nabla^2 \phi)\, \dot{\theta} \\ &\quad + \frac{m}{2} \oint \epsilon^{ij} \partial_j \theta \ \dot{\theta}\, dS_i - m \oint n \cdot \partial \phi \ \dot{\theta} + W(t_f) - W(t_0) \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

In arriving at this expression, we have done some partial integrations using the fact that we can take ϕ and its tangential derivative to vanish on ∂D. Also, in (45)

$$W(t) = \frac{m}{2} \int d^2x\, \partial_i \theta\, \partial_i \phi \tag{46}$$

In the action we have $W(t_f) - W(t_0)$ which is the result of an integration over time of the expression $\dot{W}$; thus it is equivalent to a canonical transformation. In considering the wave functions as obtained by a path integral of e^{iS}, we see that we can write

$$\Psi = e^{iW}\, \psi \tag{47}$$

where ψ is obtained from the theory defined by the action (45) with the W's omitted.

The Hamiltonian as an operator on ψ's is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \int \frac{1}{2} \left[(\nabla \dot{\theta})^2 + (\nabla \dot{\phi})^2 + (-\nabla^2 \phi)^2 \right] \tag{48}$$

Varying the time-derivative terms in S, we can identify the canonical structure as

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^2x \left[-\nabla^2 (\dot{\theta} - m\, \phi)\, \delta\theta + (-\nabla^2 \dot{\phi})\, \delta\phi \right]$$

$$+ \oint \left(n_i \partial_i \dot{\theta} + \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j \theta - m\, n \cdot \partial \phi \right) \delta\theta \tag{49}$$

In this form, we have dropped W's, so the expressions for the operators when we use this canonical structure correspond to their action on the ψ's, same as for the Hamiltonian (48). As we did for the Maxwell theory, we can now solve the Gauss law (44) as

$$\dot{\theta} = m\, \phi + \oint \alpha(y)\, n \cdot \partial_y\, G(y,x) \tag{50}$$

The canonical structure, reduced by the Gauss law, is given by

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^2x\ (-\nabla^2 \dot{\phi})\, \delta\phi \ + \ \oint \left(\alpha(y)\, M(y,x) + \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j \theta \right) \delta\theta \tag{51}$$

The variables conjugate to ϕ, θ are clear from this.

The Hamiltonian can now be simplified using the solution of the Gauss law to get

$$\mathcal{H} = \int \frac{1}{2} \left[m^2\, (\nabla\phi)^2 + (\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 + (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 \right] + \frac{1}{2} \oint \alpha(y)\, M(y,x)\, \alpha(x) \tag{52}$$

Again we have used the boundary condition $\phi = 0$ in carrying out some partial integrations; we have also used the fact that $\nabla_x^2 \oint \alpha(y)\, n \cdot \partial_y G(y,x) = 0$. From the canonical one-form (51), we can read off the conjugate momenta as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_\phi(x) &= -\nabla^2 \dot{\phi}(x) = \dot{B}(x) \\ \Pi_\theta(x) &= \oint_y \alpha(y)\, M(y,x) + \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j \theta(x) \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

It is worth emphasizing that other than ϕ and its conjugate, the dynamical variables are α which is defined on the edge and the value of θ on the edge; although bulk values of θ occur in the phase factor due to W, it is only the boundary value which is dynamical. It is useful to write the commutation rules in terms of α, since the Hamiltonian involves these variables. First we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(x) &= \int_y \left(\Pi_\theta - \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j \theta \right) M^{-1}(y,x) \equiv \int_y Q(y)\, M^{-1}(y,x) \\ Q(x) &= \Pi_\theta - \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j \theta \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

The commutation rules are now easily obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} [Q(f), Q(h)] &= -i \frac{m}{2} \oint \epsilon^{ij} n_i\, (f\, \partial_j h - \partial_j f\, h) \\ Q(f) &= \oint f \left(\Pi_\theta - \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j \theta \right) = \oint \left(f\, \Pi_\theta + \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} n_i \partial_j f\, \theta \right) \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

Here we are considering a closed boundary. The last term of the Hamiltonian (52), the boundary term, is

$$H_{bndry} = \frac{1}{2} \oint Q(x)\, M^{-1}(x,y)\, Q(y) \tag{56}$$

This boundary term gives a series of states, which by virtue of (55), will have energies proportional to m, i.e., to k. These edge modes are precisely the ones discussed in [11]; we have thus reproduced their result using our parametrization for the fields.

We can now calculate the wave function ψ using the Hamiltonian (52, 56). The bulk part of the Hamiltonian is decoupled from the boundary modes and we can obtain the ground state wave function for the bulk modes separately. From the canonical momentum Π_ϕ in (53), we see that $\dot{\phi} = -i\delta/\delta B$ and so the Hamiltonian is

$$H_{bulk} = \frac{1}{2}\int \left[-\frac{\delta}{\delta B}(-\nabla^2)\frac{\delta}{\delta B} + B(x)\left(\delta(x-y) - m^2 G(x,y)\right) B(y)\right] \tag{57}$$

We can use this to find the ground state wave function for the whole plane as

$$\begin{aligned}\psi &= \mathcal{N}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int B(x)\left(\frac{\sqrt{p^2+m^2}}{p^2}\right)_{x,y} B(y)\right] \\ &= \mathcal{N}\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int \phi(x)\left(p^2\sqrt{p^2+m^2}\right)_{x,y}\phi(y)\right]\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

The full wave function, including the phase factor from (47) is

$$\Psi = \mathcal{N}\exp\left(i\frac{m}{2}\int d^2x\,\partial_i\theta\,\partial_i\phi\right)\ \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int \phi(x)\left(p^2\sqrt{p^2+m^2}\right)_{x,y}\phi(y)\right] \tag{59}$$

As we did for the Maxwell theory, if we define $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$, we can write this as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi &= \mathcal{N}\exp\left(i\frac{m}{2}\oint \theta n\cdot\partial\phi + i\frac{m}{2}\int d^2x\,\theta\sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\varphi\right) \\ &\quad\times\exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\int \varphi(x)\left(\sqrt{p^2+m^2}\right)_{x,y}\varphi(y)\right]\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

We may now consider proceeding along the lines of what we did for the Maxwell theory, splitting the spatial plane into two regions I and II. However, the situation is a bit different from the Maxwell case, and there are a few issues we must address.

i) The edge modes corresponding to the dynamical variables Q are again not relevant for entanglement. They are due to the fact that true gauge transformations were taken to be the identity on ∂D. This is again evident from the fact that, modulo the invertible factor $M(y,x)$, Q is conjugate to θ on the edge. For the interface ∂I, we expect that Gauss law will ensure that there are no such modes. (But there can be other edge modes because the CS term is strictly not gauge invariant in region I or II by itself; we discuss this shortly.) So we could consider a sector of the theory where the edge modes are absent. This was done by setting $\alpha = 0$ for the Maxwell case, but it is a bit different for the present case. This is because the Q's do not commute among themselves, as is evident form (55). So we cannot just set $Q = 0$, but we can separate out commuting subsets and choose the maximal commuting subset of operators to be zero. For example, if D is a circular disc with $\partial D = S^1$, we can use $e^{in\beta}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \le \beta \le 2\pi$

as a complete set of modes. We then see from (55) that $Q_n = Q(e^{in\beta})$, and $Q_{-n} = Q(e^{-in\beta})$, $n > 0$, are conjugate to each other. We may therefore set $Q_n = 0$, $Q_0 = 0$. These can be viewed as set of first class constraints (in the sense of Dirac's theory of constraints) and we can choose $Q_{-n} = 0$ as the conjugate constraints. All of Q will then get eliminated; the difference with the Maxwell case is that this procedure appears as a symplectic reduction for the MCS case.

ii) Secondly, the phase factor e^{iW} is not important for considerations of entanglement. The action, once α and θ on ∂D have been eliminated, is

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int \Big[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 - m^2(\nabla\phi)^2\Big] + W(t_f) - W(t_i) \tag{61}$$

Consider the computation of correlation functions of gauge invariant operators. Such operators can all be constructed from ϕ, since that is all we need for the Wilson loop and the latter constitute a complete set of observables. The form of the action (61) shows that the path integral is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(t_f) &= e^{iW(t_f)} \int [d\phi]\; e^{iS(\phi,t_f,t_i)}\; \Psi(t_i) \\ S(\phi,t_f,t_i) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt \int d^2x\; \Big[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 - m^2(\nabla\phi)^2\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Thus correlation functions involving any function of ϕ at any intermediate value of time will not involve the phase due to W. For this reason, the gauge-invariant theory can be reduced to

$$S(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x\; \Big[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 - m^2(\nabla\phi)^2\Big] \tag{63}$$

There is another way to see this result as well. In terms of the complex components $\partial_z = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_1 + i\,\partial_2)$, $A_z = \frac{1}{2}(A_1 + i\,A_2)$, the parametrization $A_i = \partial_i\theta + \epsilon_{ij}\partial_j\phi$ can be written as

$$A_z = -i\,\partial_z M\, M^{-1}, \qquad A_{\bar{z}} = i\,M^{\dagger-1}\partial_{\bar{z}}M^{\dagger} \tag{64}$$

where $M = \exp(\phi + i\,\theta)$. We see that both components of A are defined in terms of M which has values in the complexification of the gauge group $U(1)$. We have argued previously that we should use the variable $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$ to isolate entanglement in a simple way. A similar change of variables for θ would be to use $\sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\theta = \tilde{\theta}$. Further, the metric on the space of gauge potentials can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} ds_A^2 &= \int \delta A_i \delta A_i = 4\int \delta A\delta\bar{A} = 4\int \big(\delta\phi(-\nabla^2)\delta\phi + \delta\theta(-\nabla^2)\delta\theta\big) \\ &= 4\int \Big[\delta\varphi\,\delta\varphi + \delta\tilde{\theta}\,\delta\tilde{\theta}\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

This gives the local form for the volume measure

$$d\mu_A = \prod_x d\varphi(x)\, d\tilde{\theta}(x), \tag{66}$$

which is factorizable into corresponding expressions in each of the regions I and II. We also see that the phase factor e^{iW} can be written as

$$e^{iW} = \exp\left(i\frac{m}{2}\int \tilde{\theta}\varphi\right) = \exp\left(i\frac{m}{2}\int \tilde{\theta}\varphi\right)_{\rm I} \exp\left(i\frac{m}{2}\int \tilde{\theta}\varphi\right)_{\rm II} \tag{67}$$

This shows that one can eliminate the phase factors separately in each region. (Notice that the boundary term in the phase factor in (60), namely, $\oint \theta\partial_n\phi$ is absent because we have eliminated α, θ on the boundary ∂D of the full space.)

iii) The result of this argument is that we can use the wave function (60) without the phase factor e^{iW}, which corresponds to the wave function for a scalar field of mass m. So it would seem that we can now consider separating φ into each region and integrating over one region to get a reduced density matrix. However, the scalar field theory defined on region I (likewise region II) does not constitute what we obtain by quantizing the MCS theory on I (likewise II). This is because, the MCS theory defined on region I (or II) does not have gauge invariance. We cannot make a consistent theory without including a surface action on the interface to take care of gauge invariance. Thus to provide a proper comparison between what is obtained from splitting (63) and the MCS theory in each region, we must consider the gauge invariant action for the MCS case in each region separately (with an appropriate interface action included) and then compare that result with the result of splitting (63). The needed action on the interface can be identified from the variation of the CS term under gauge transformations. This can be taken as the action for a chiral bosonic field σ given by

$$S_{ch} = \frac{ke^2}{4\pi}\int dt \oint \left[\partial_0\sigma\left(\partial_\tau\sigma + A_\tau\right) - \sigma\,\dot{A}_\tau + A_0\,A_\tau\right] \tag{68}$$

Here ∂_τ, A_τ denote the components tangential to the boundary/interface, with τ being the coordinate for the same. Because the gauge group is $U(1)$, it is sufficient for $e^{i\sigma}$ to be a periodic function on the closed boundary, so σ is periodic modulo a 2π shift.

Under a gauge transformation

$$A_i \to A_i + \partial_i f, \qquad \sigma \to \sigma - f \tag{69}$$

we get $S_{ch} \to S_{ch} + \Delta S_{ch}$, with

$$\Delta S_{ch} = \frac{ke^2}{4\pi}\int dt \oint f\,\epsilon^{ij} n_i(\partial_0 A_j - \partial_j A_0) \tag{70}$$

after a partial integration. (The partial integration is justified because this is on the interface which is closed.) It is easy to verify that this will cancel the variation of the CS term under a gauge transformation and so the consistent theory is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S &= S_1 + S_{ch} \\ S_1 &= \int d^3x\ \left[\frac{1}{2}(E^2 - B^2) + \frac{ke^2}{4\pi}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha}A_\mu\partial_\nu A_\alpha\right] \end{aligned}$$

$$S_{ch} = \frac{ke^2}{4\pi}\int dt \oint \Big[\partial_0\sigma\,(\partial_\tau\sigma + A_\tau) - \sigma\,\dot{A}_\tau + A_0\,A_\tau\Big] \tag{71}$$

What we want to do now is to analyze this theory and build up the MCS theory on the whole plane from the theory (71) defined in each of the regions I and II. This will show if any additional ingredients are needed when we consider splitting the MCS theory such that we have a consistent theory in each region.

3.3 Building up MCS on the plane from MCS in each region

We will first reconsider the analysis without the chiral action, treating just the theory defined by S_1; this will highlight the need for the chiral action. The canonical one-form and two-form for this case are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A} &= \int \Big[E_i\,\delta A_i - \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{ij}A_i\,\delta A_j\Big] \\ \Omega &= \int \Big[\delta E_i\,\delta A_i - \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{ij}\delta A_i\,\delta A_j\Big]\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

We get

$$\left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A_i} + m\epsilon_{ij}\frac{\delta}{\delta E_j}\right)\rfloor\,\Omega = -\delta E_i \tag{73}$$

(This is without the contribution from S_{ch}.) The vector field on the left hand side is the Hamiltonian vector field for E_i. The vector field for A_i is $-(\delta/\delta E_i)$. The commutation rules are thus

$$\begin{aligned}[E_i(x),\,E_j(y)] &= -im\,\epsilon_{ij}\,\delta(x-y) \\ [E_i(x),\,A_j(y)] &= -i\delta_{ij}\delta(x-y) \\ [A_i(x),\,A_j(y)] &= 0\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Gauge transformations correspond to $A_i \to A_i + \partial_i f$, $E_i \to E_i$. For the corresponding vector field we find

$$\int\left(\partial_i f\frac{\delta}{\delta A_i}\right)\rfloor\Omega = -\delta\left[\int \partial_i f\,(E_i + m\epsilon_{ij}A_j)\right] \tag{75}$$

This identifies the generator of gauge transformations as

$$G(f) = \int \partial_i f\,(E_i + m\epsilon_{ij}A_j) \tag{76}$$

From the commutation rules we find

$$[G(f),\,G(h)] = im\int \epsilon^{ij}\partial_i f\,\partial_j h = im\oint f\,\partial_\tau h \tag{77}$$

where $\partial_\tau = n_i\epsilon_{ij}\partial_j$ is the tangential derivative on the boundary. This shows that we get a closed algebra for gauge transformations only if the test functions vanish or go to a constant

on the boundary. For test functions which vanish on the boundary, Gauss law is equivalent to $G(f) = 0$. This is the case for a real boundary. In this case, the CS term is also invariant since gauge transformations vanish on the boundary. However, for the interface between the two regions I and II, we have no reason to require the test functions to vanish; they can be arbitrary functions. The result (77) shows that, for such a situation, we cannot factor out gauge transformations and obtain a description in terms of gauge-invariant variables. This is not surprising, since the CS term is also not gauge-invariant. The solution is that we need to add a chiral action to render the full action gauge invariant at the interface, if we want to have separately well-defined theories in each region and then build up the theory on the full space from these.

Turning then to the case with the chiral action added, the full action (71) is obviously gauge invariant, even for those transformations which do not vanish on the boundary. Now consider the variation of the action with respect to A_0,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S &= \int \Big[E_i(-\partial_i \delta A_0) + \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{ij}\,(\delta A_0\,\partial_i A_j + A_i \partial_j \delta A_0)\Big] + \frac{m}{2}\oint \delta A_0\, A_\tau \\ &= -G(\delta A_0) \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

where

$$G(\delta A_0) = \int \Big(\partial_i \delta A_0\ E_i - m \delta A_0\, B \Big) \tag{79}$$

Extremization of the action amounts to imposing $G(\delta A_0) = 0$, even for those $\delta A_0 \neq 0$ on the boundary. This certainly implies the Gauss law $\nabla \cdot E + m\, B = 0$ in the interior of each region.

We now set $A_0 = 0$ and consider the canonical structure with the chiral action added. We find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \int \Big[E_i\, \delta A_i - \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{ij} A_i\, \delta A_j \Big] + \frac{m}{2}\oint (\partial_\tau \sigma + 2\, A_\tau)\, \delta\sigma \\ \Omega &= \int \Big[\delta E_i\, \delta A_i - \frac{m}{2}\epsilon^{ij} \delta A_i\, \delta A_j \Big] - \frac{m}{2}\oint \delta\sigma\, (\partial_\tau \delta\sigma + 2\, \delta A_\tau) \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Our first step is to work out the commutation rules from these. For this we need the Hamiltonian vector fields for various quantities. With a bit of algebra, it is straightforward to verify that the required vector fields are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A}_i &\longleftrightarrow -\frac{\delta}{\delta E_i} \\ \hat{\sigma}(\tau) &\longleftrightarrow -\frac{1}{m}\oint_{\tau'} \mathcal{E}(\tau' - \tau)\frac{\delta}{\delta\sigma(\tau')} + \oint_{\tau'} \mathcal{E}(\tau' - \tau) n_i \epsilon_{ij} \frac{\delta}{\delta E_j(\tau')} \\ \hat{E}_i &\longleftrightarrow \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A_i} + m\epsilon_{ij}\frac{\delta}{\delta E_j} \right) + m\oint \left[\mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau')\epsilon_{ij} n_j \delta(x - \tau')) \right]\ \epsilon_{kl} n_l \frac{\delta}{\delta E_k(\tau)} \\ &\quad + \oint \left[\mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau')\epsilon_{ij} n_j \delta(x - \tau') \right] \frac{\delta}{\delta\sigma(\tau)} \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Here τ, τ' indicate the coordinate along the interface. Also we have defined the sign function

$$\mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') = \frac{1}{2}\left[\Theta(\tau - \tau') - \Theta(\tau' - \tau) \right] \tag{82}$$

where Θ is the step function. The derivative of this is given by

$$\partial_\tau \mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') = \delta(\tau - \tau') \tag{83}$$

For brevity, we define $\tilde{n}_i = \epsilon_{ij} n_j$. The commutation rules can now be worked out from the vector fields given above as

$$\begin{aligned}
[A_i(x),\, A_j(y)] &= 0 \\
[A_i(x),\, E_j(y)] &= i\delta_{ij}\delta(x-y) \\
[E_i(x),\, E_j(y)] &= (-im)\left[\epsilon_{ij}\delta(x-y) + \oint \tilde{n}_i\tilde{n}_j \mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')\delta(x-\tau')\delta(y-\tau)\right] \\
[A_i(x),\, \sigma(\tau)] &= 0 \\
[E_i(x),\, \sigma(\tau)] &= -i \oint_{\tau'} \mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')\, \tilde{n}_i \delta(x-\tau') \\
[\sigma(\tau),\, \sigma(\tau')] &= -\frac{i}{m}\mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Associated to the field σ, we can also define $J = m(\partial_\tau \sigma + A_\tau)$. This will turn out to be the chiral current. It is obviously gauge-invariant. For J, we find the commutation rules

$$\begin{aligned}
[J(\tau),\, J(\tau')] &= -im\,\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau'}\delta(\tau-\tau') \\
[A_i(x), J(\tau)] &= 0 \\
[E_i(x),\, J(\tau)] &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Notice that J commutes with both A_i and E_i. Gauge transformations are generated by

$$V = \int \partial_i f\, \frac{\delta}{\delta A_i} - \oint f \frac{\delta}{\delta\sigma} \tag{86}$$

We find that $V\rfloor\Omega = -\delta(G(f))$, identifying the generator of the gauge transformations as

$$G(f) = \int (\partial_i f\, E_i - m\, f\, B) \tag{87}$$

The vanishing of this is indeed the equation of motion for A_0, from (79), consistent with expectations. Further, since $A_i(x)$ commutes with $A_j(y)$ and B is gauge invariant,

$$\begin{aligned}
[G(f),\, G(h)] &= [\int \partial_i f\, E_i,\, \int \partial_j h\, E_j] - m[\int fB,\, \int \partial_j h\, E_j] - m[\int \partial_i f\, E_i,\, \int hB] \\
&= [\int \partial_i f\, E_i,\, \int \partial_j h\, E_j] - m[\int fB,\, G(h)] - m[\int G(f),\, \int hB] \\
&= [\int \partial_i f\, E_i,\, \int \partial_j h\, E_j] \\
&= (-im)\left[\int \partial_i f\, \partial_j h\, \epsilon_{ij} + \oint \mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')\, \partial_\tau f(\tau)\, \partial_\tau h(\tau')\right] \\
&= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

Thus there is no obstruction to implementing the constraint $G(f) = 0$, resolving the issue we mentioned after (77). There is no surprise here since we now have a fully gauge invariant action, even for those transformations which do not vanish on the interface.

Observables involving σ must have the combination $\partial_\tau \sigma + A_\tau = J/m$ for reasons of gauge-invariance. Therefore, if we introduce a Hamiltonian for the σ field, it must involve J's. Since J commutes with the (A_i, E_i) part, the dynamics of J-dependent quantities will decouple from the dynamics of the gauge fields. So we can introduce a new field Σ which is designed to reproduce the algebra for the J's. The action for this is obviously given by

$$S = \frac{m}{2} \int dt \oint \partial_\tau \Sigma \, \partial_0 \Sigma \tag{89}$$

with J defined as $J = m \, \partial_\tau \Sigma$.

As for the (A_i, E_i) sector, we have an extra term in the commutator for the electric fields, see (84). We now ask if there is a modification of the gauge field action which gives the modified algebra (with the extra boundary term from (84)) for the E's. Such an action is given by

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int \left[\dot{A}^2 - B^2 - m \epsilon^{ij} A_i \partial_0 A_j \right] - \frac{m}{2} \oint \mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') \, A_\tau(\tau) \, \dot{A}_\tau(\tau') \tag{90}$$

The last term will not contribute to the Hamiltonian. The canonical structure for this action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \int \left[E_i \, \delta A_i - \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} A_i \, \delta A_j \right] - \frac{m}{2} \oint \mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') \, A_\tau(\tau) \, \delta A_\tau(\tau') \\ \Omega &= \int \left[\delta E_i \, \delta A_i - \frac{m}{2} \epsilon^{ij} \delta A_i \, \delta A_j \right] - \frac{m}{2} \oint \mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') \, \delta A_\tau(\tau) \, \delta A_\tau(\tau') \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

The vector field for A_i is as before. The vector field for E_i is identified from this Ω as

$$\hat{E}_i \;\longleftrightarrow\; \left(\frac{\delta}{\delta A_i} + m \epsilon_{ij} \frac{\delta}{\delta E_j} \right) + m \oint \left[\mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') \, \tilde{n}_i \delta(x - \tau')) \right] \, \tilde{n}_k \frac{\delta}{\delta E_k(\tau)} \tag{92}$$

which are exactly the terms in (81) except for the σ-dependent part. Thus we will reproduce the algebra of the A_i, E_i as in (84).

What we have shown then is the equivalence of two theories. Theory α is defined by (71) with the action

$$S_\alpha = \int d^3x \, \left[\frac{1}{2}(E^2 - B^2) + \frac{k}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha} A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\alpha \right] + \frac{m}{2} \int dt \oint \left[\partial_0 \sigma \, (\partial_\tau \sigma + A_\tau) - \sigma \, \dot{A}_\tau + A_0 \, A_\tau \right] \tag{93}$$

Theory β is defined by

$$S_\beta = \frac{1}{2} \int \left[\dot{A}^2 - B^2 - m \epsilon^{ij} A_i \partial_0 A_j \right] - \frac{m}{2} \oint \mathcal{E}(\tau - \tau') \, A_\tau(\tau) \, \dot{A}_\tau(\tau') + \frac{m}{2} \int dt \oint \partial_\tau \Sigma \, \partial_0 \Sigma \tag{94}$$

(This is in $A_0 = 0$ gauge.)

3.4 The logic of the splitting and entanglement

We can now reanalyze the logic of the problem as follows. For entanglement calculations for the MCS theory, we need a splitting of the theory into the two regions I and II. The full theory on the plane is given by

$$S = \int d^3x \ \left[\frac{1}{2}(E^2 - B^2) + \frac{k}{4\pi}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha}A_\mu\partial_\nu A_\alpha\right] \tag{95}$$

Here we assume that we only demand invariance under gauge transformations which go to the identity at spatial infinity, so this action is gauge invariant and acceptable. The analysis of this theory (on the whole plane) is essentially what we did in the first part and agrees with [11]. We have the edge modes defined by the Q's, but these can be set to zero as a choice of boundary data. They are not important for the question of defining the theory in each region.

To proceed further, we consider first writing everything in terms of the gauge invariant field ϕ. We can then try to split the full theory as defined in terms of the action for ϕ. Thus on regions $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{II}$ (which is the whole plane) we have a single theory for the scalar field ϕ with the action

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int \left[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 - m^2(\nabla\phi)^2\right] \tag{96}$$

When this is split, we get similar theories separately on I and II. But there is no guarantee that the reduction of the MCS theory on I or II using gauge-invariant variables would give these theories. There may be additional terms because we need the chiral action for gauge invariance; and we do need to have gauge invariance for test functions which do not vanish on the interface between I and II, as that was part of the original implementation of the gauss law where we did not (and should not) require that the test functions to vanish on the interface. We can build up the full theory in terms of theories defined consistently in each region. Take these subtheories to be the MCS with the chiral action, i.e., the α version in (93). Then we use the fact that this is equivalent to the β-version in (94). Putting together S_β for the two regions we find

$$(S_\beta)_{\mathrm{I}} + (S_\beta)_{\mathrm{II}} = (S_{MCS})_{\mathrm{I+II}} + \frac{m}{2}\int dt \oint (\partial_\tau\Sigma\,\partial_0\Sigma)_{\mathrm{I}} - \frac{m}{2}\int dt \oint (\partial_\tau\Sigma\,\partial_0\Sigma)_{\mathrm{II}} \tag{97}$$

where we use the fact that

$$\frac{m}{2}\oint_{\partial\mathrm{I}} \mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')\,A_\tau(\tau)\,\dot{A}_\tau(\tau') + \frac{m}{2}\oint_{\partial\mathrm{II}} \mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')\,A_\tau(\tau)\,\dot{A}_\tau(\tau') = 0 \tag{98}$$

because of the change of orientation between the boundary as approached from the two regions and the matching of the fields. The connecting minus sign for the Σ terms in (97) is also because of the change of orientation.

So far S_{MCS} which is identical to $(S_{MCS})_{\mathrm{I+II}}$ is still in terms of the gauge potentials. But now we can go to *gauge-invariant variables on the whole plane* and thus we get

$$(S_\beta)_{\mathrm{I}} + (S_\beta)_{\mathrm{II}} = \frac{1}{2}\int \left[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 - m^2(\nabla\phi)^2\right] + \frac{m}{2}\int dt \left(\oint (\partial_\tau\Sigma\,\partial_0\Sigma)_{\mathrm{I}} - \oint (\partial_\tau\Sigma\,\partial_0\Sigma)_{\mathrm{II}}\right) \tag{99}$$

In the original chiral action we need $\sigma_{\rm I} = \sigma_{\rm II} + 2\pi z$, where z is an integer, and $(A_\tau)_{\rm I} = (A_\tau)_{\rm II}$ to match things at the interface. Thus we also need $\Sigma_{\rm I} = \Sigma_{\rm II} + 2\pi z$. As for the ϕ-part, we can now split it as we do for scalars, modulo the issue of having to go to $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$.

What this proves is the inequivalence of the following two procedures:

1. We go to gauge invariant variables ϕ on the whole plane, then split the resulting theory into two regions. (This result will coincide with the case of a massive scalar, for the variable $\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\phi$.)

2. We want to make sure the split theories do agree with what we expect to find from consistent theories defined in each region, so we build up the full theory from such regionally defined theories. This would give the same scalar field result plus the result of two topological actions as in (99) with the identification $\Sigma_{\rm I} = \Sigma_{\rm II} + 2\pi z$.

We can now use (99) to compute the EE for the MCS theory. Pure Chern-Simons theory is known to generate a topological and universal contribution to EE [14], but we also need to consider the non-topological degrees of freedom generated by the presence of the Maxwell term. The two degrees of freedom that contribute to the EE in the present case are the bulk mode, ϕ (which contributes an amount that is identical to that of a massive scalar field), and the edge mode Σ. The contribution of the edge mode to the EE is the same as that in the pure Chern-Simons case. This is because the dynamics of the Σ field is independent of the the gauge field dynamics, as is clear from the action (94). The action for Σ also agrees with the effective action for Chern-Simons edge modes computed in the previous literature. We may note that a Hamiltonian derivation of the EE for the pure Chern-Simons case has also been reported in the recent past [13]. Thus, once the reduction of the action to the β-version, with an independent decoupled dynamics for Σ is obtained, the techniques from those papers can straightforwardly be used to compute the edge-EE (99). However it is worthwhile stressing that our analysis makes two issues explicit:

1. The edge mode, Σ, is manifestly gauge invariant.

2. The bulk and edge degrees of freedom completely decouple for the MCS theory, ensuring that the Maxwell term does not contribute to the topological entanglement.

For the sake of completeness we now give some details of the computation of the EE from the Σ fields and refer to [13] for further technical details. One can take the entangling surface to be a circle of length l without loss of generality. After rescaling the fields $\Sigma = X/\sqrt{k}$ and adding a potential energy term, the edge action can be taken to be

$$S^{edge} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int dt \oint \left(-\partial_0 X^{\rm II}\partial_\tau X^{\rm II} + \partial_0 X^{\rm I}\partial_\tau X^{\rm I} + v\left((\partial_\tau X^{\rm I})^2 + (\partial_\tau X^{\rm II})^2\right)\right) \tag{100}$$

v will be taken to zero at the end of the computation and can be regarded as a UV cutoff. The fields $X^{\rm I}$ and $X^{\rm II}$ are defined on the two sides of the edge. The original fields Σ obey the

periodic conditions

$$\Sigma^{\rm I/II}(\tau+2\pi)=\Sigma^{\rm I/II}(\tau)+2\,\pi\,z^{\rm I/II} \tag{101}$$

This translates to $X^{\rm I/II}(\tau+2\pi)=X^{\rm I/II}(\tau)+2\sqrt{k}\,\pi z^{\rm I/II}$, where z is an integer. Further, the "gluing" together of the two regions requires one to identify the fields while preserving the periodicity constraint. This is achieved by adding the "tunneling" term

$$S^{tunnel}=\frac{\lambda}{2\pi}\int\oint\left[\cos(\Sigma^{\rm I}-\Sigma^{\rm II})-1\right] \tag{102}$$

to the edge action S^{edge} in (100). Taking the limit $\lambda\to\infty$ enforces the fields to be identified on the edge, effectively "gluing" the regions I and II. For practical purposes, one expands the cosine above to quadratic order and applies the standard mode expansion for the fields [13].

$$\begin{aligned}
X^{\rm I} &= X_0^{\rm I}+\frac{2\pi}{l}N^{\rm I}\,\tau+\sum_{n<0}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{|n|}}\alpha_n e^{2\pi i n\tau/l}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{|n|}}\alpha_n^\dagger e^{-2\pi i n\tau/l}\right]\\
X^{\rm II} &= X_0^{\rm II}+\frac{2\pi}{l}N^{\rm II}\,\tau+\sum_{n>0}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\alpha_n e^{2\pi i n\tau/l}+\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\alpha_n^\dagger e^{-2\pi i n\tau/l}\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

The zero mode operators X_0 and N are canonical conjugates, i.e., $[X_0^{\rm I},N^{\rm I}]=i$, $[X_0^{\rm II},N^{\rm II}]=-i$ as are the oscillator modes $[\alpha_n,\alpha_m^\dagger]=\delta_{nm}$. These expansions allow one to write the quadratic Hamiltonian as the sum of a zero-mode Hamiltonian

$$H_0=\frac{\pi v}{2l}\left((N^{\rm I}+N^{\rm II})^2+l^2\;\tilde\lambda(X_0^{\rm I}-X_0^{\rm II})^2\right) \tag{104}$$

and an oscillator Hamiltonian

$$H_\alpha=\frac{\pi v}{2l}\sum_{n\neq0}\left(4|n|\alpha_n^\dagger\alpha_n+2|n|+\frac{l^2\tilde\lambda}{|n|}(\alpha_n\alpha_n^\dagger-\alpha_n\alpha_{-n}+\alpha_n^\dagger\alpha_n-\alpha_n^\dagger\alpha_{-n}^\dagger)\right) \tag{105}$$

where $\tilde\lambda=\lambda/2\pi^2kv$. The truncated action is only invariant under translations of $X_0^{\rm I/II}$ by equal integers. Further in deriving (104), (105) we imposed the condition $(N^{\rm I}-N^{\rm II})|0\rangle=0$ on the ground state. H_α can be diagonalized by a suitable Bogoliubov transformation and the ground state density matrices for both H_α and H_0 can be separately computed. The EE resulting from integrating out the I or II modes can be expressed as [13]

$$S_E(k)=\frac{\pi^2 l}{12}\sqrt{\tilde\lambda}\;-\;\frac{1}{2}\ln k+\cdots \tag{106}$$

where the ellipsis represent terms that are subleading in $1/l$. The first term is the cutoff dependent "area" term in which we see that the large λ,l and small v limits consistently reinforce each other. The second term is the topological entropy.[3] Dropping the subleading

[3]This result can also be obtained using conformal field theory techniques [15] or by applying the replica trick to the Chern-Simons path integral [16].

terms, the total EE for the MCS theory (including the contribution from the bulk field) can be expressed as

$$S_{MCS} = S_E(k) + S_E(m) \tag{107}$$

where the bulk contribution $S_E(m)$ is given explicitly in (8)[4]. Interestingly, we see that there is a second finite area dependent contribution proportional to the level number k in the MCS theory which arises due to the bulk gauge fields. Both the finite terms involving k contribute negatively to the entropy of entanglement.

We close this section with a couple of comments. Notice that observables defined on the *whole plane* only see ϕ. For instance, we may think of Wilson loops, which can be expressed entirely in terms of ϕ. Thus all correlators for all observables are insensitive to the extra current algebras provided by the Σs. So even if we define an entropy of entanglement, which may be sensitive to these current algebras, anything we measure in terms of observables will not see any effect due to the Σs.

Also in the context of our discussion of the theory with the chiral action and its β-version, a question that might naturally arise is whether we can drop the chiral action completely, and instead use the nonlocal term

$$-\frac{m}{2}\oint \mathcal{E}(\tau-\tau')\, A_\tau(\tau)\, \dot{A}_\tau(\tau')$$

to ensure gauge invariance of the CS term. If so, we would not encounter the current algebras. The basic reason to rule out such a procedure would be its nonlocality. The β-theory, which includes the chiral action for Σ, is equivalent to the local α-version of the theory. The chiral action allows us to start with a local action in each region.

3.5 Maxwell-Higgs theory and the nonlocal mass term in 2+1 dimensions

Following our consideration of the Chern-Simons term in the previous section, we now turn to alternate mechanisms for rendering abelian gauge field massive. The Higgs mechanism is, of course, the best known procedure for generating massive gauge fields. One might also consider a direct deformation of the Maxwell action by the addition of gauge invariant mass terms. We will start with the Higgs mechanism. For a $U(1)$ gauge theory which is spontaneously broken the action may be taken to be

$$S = \int d^3x \ \left[\frac{F^2}{4} + (D\phi)^*(D\phi) + \lambda(\phi^*\phi - \frac{v^2}{2})^2\right] \tag{108}$$

Here ϕ is the complex-valued Higgs field and $D\phi = \partial\phi - ieA\,\phi$. The functional integral would, as usual, be given as

$$Z = \int d\mu(\mathcal{C})\, [d\phi d\phi^*]\ e^{-S} \tag{109}$$

[4]The periodicity conditions (101) imply that the entangling surface have a circular topology, while (8) was computed for the half plane. To add $S_E(m)$ to the Chern-Simons contribution as in (107) we should regard the planar expression for $S_E(m)$ as the infinite radius limit of the entropy computed on a a circle.

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the gauge invariant configuration space for the gauge fields. We will be interested in the $\lambda \to \infty$ limit were the modulus of $\phi = |\phi| e^{i\eta}$ will decouple. The contribution of $|\phi|$ to the theory and entanglement entropy can be computed using the standard methods applicable to scalar fields. In this limit, dropping the integration over $|\phi|$, the functional integral of interest to us is

$$\begin{aligned} Z &= \int d\mu(\mathcal{C})\, [d\eta]\; e^{-\tilde{S}} \\ \tilde{S} &= \int d^3x\; \left[\frac{F_{\mu\nu}^2}{4} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \tilde{\eta} - \mu A_\mu)^2 \right] \end{aligned} \tag{110}$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = v\,\eta$ and $\mu = ev$. This action still has gauge invariance under $A_\mu \to A_\mu + \partial_\mu f$, $\tilde{\eta} \to \tilde{\eta} + \mu\, f$.

We will now do gauge fixing *à la* BRST which will help to elucidate the number of degrees of freedom. We will then take up the Hamiltonian analysis and the vacuum wave function. We will carry out the analysis for the entire plane. The purpose is to obtain the form of the wave function. Apart from the Higgs field, the analysis is similar to the case of the Maxwell theory and we don't expect any contribution to EE from additional boundary terms, since the theory, unlike the MCS case, can be defined in a gauge invariant way in each subregion.

The BRST transformations are given by

$$\begin{aligned} Q\, A_\mu = \partial_\mu c, \qquad & Q\, c = 0 \\ Q\, \bar{c} = i\, N, \qquad & Q\, N = 0 \\ Q\, \tilde{\eta} = \mu\, c & \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

For the gauge fixing term we choose

$$S_{gf} = Q \int d^3x\; \left[\bar{c} \left(\partial \cdot A - \mu \tilde{\eta} - \frac{i}{2} N \right) \right] \tag{112}$$

with the full action to be used in the functional integral being $S_Q = \tilde{S} + S_{gf}$. Using the BRST transformation rules (111), we get

$$S_Q = \int d^3x\; \left[\frac{F^2}{4} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial\tilde{\eta} - \mu\, A)^2 + i\, N \left(\partial \cdot A - \mu\, \tilde{\eta} - \frac{i}{2}\, N \right) - \bar{c}(\Box\, c - \mu^2 c) \right] \tag{113}$$

In the functional integral, we can integrate out the Lautrup-Nakanishi field N to get

$$\begin{aligned} S_Q &= \int d^3x\; \left[\frac{F^2}{4} + \frac{1}{2}(\partial\tilde{\eta} - \mu\, A)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\,(\partial \cdot A - \mu\, \tilde{\eta})^2 + \bar{c}(-\Box + \mu^2)\, c \right] \\ &= \int d^3x\; \left[\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu A_\nu\, \partial_\mu A_\nu + \mu^2 A_\nu\, A_\nu) + \frac{1}{2}(\partial\tilde{\eta})^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{2}\tilde{\eta}^2 + \bar{c}(-\Box + \mu^2)\, c \right] \\ &= \int d^3x\; \left[\frac{1}{2} A_\nu(-\Box + \mu^2) A_\nu + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\eta}(-\Box + \mu^2)\tilde{\eta} + \bar{c}(-\Box + \mu^2)\, c \right] \end{aligned} \tag{114}$$

If we use this and integrate over all fields, we see that the partition function is given by

$$Z = (\det K)^{-\frac{d-1}{2}} = (\det K)^{-\frac{2}{2}}, \qquad K = -\Box + \mu^2 \tag{115}$$

This shows that the degrees of freedom we have are equivalent to two massive scalar fields.

We now turn to the ground state wave function. For this, we can set up the Hamiltonian analysis of the action (110) using the $A_0 = 0$ gauge as usual. In this gauge, the action becomes

$$\tilde{S} = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x \ \Big[\dot{A}_i^2 - B^2 + \dot{\tilde{\eta}}^2 - (\nabla_i\tilde{\eta} - \mu\, A_i)^2\Big] \tag{116}$$

The Gauss law becomes

$$\nabla\cdot E - \mu\,\dot{\tilde{\eta}} = 0 \tag{117}$$

As before, we introduce the parametrization (9), i.e., $A_i = \partial_i\theta + \epsilon_{ij}\,\partial_j\phi$, so that the action simplifies as

$$\tilde{S} = \frac{1}{2}\int d^3x \ \Big[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 - (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 + (\nabla\dot{\theta})^2 + (\dot{\tilde{\eta}})^2 - [\nabla(\tilde{\eta} - \mu\,\theta)]^2 - \mu^2(\nabla\phi)^2\Big] \tag{118}$$

From this, we can identify the canonical one-form as

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^2x \ \Big[(-\nabla^2\dot{\phi})\,\delta\phi + (-\nabla^2\dot{\theta})\,\delta\theta + \dot{\tilde{\eta}}\,\delta\tilde{\eta}\Big] \tag{119}$$

A reduction of this to the gauge-invariant space is possible by using the Gauss law (117) which may be rewritten as

$$\nabla^2\dot{\theta} - \mu\,\dot{\tilde{\eta}} = 0 \tag{120}$$

The canonical one-form then becomes

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^2x \ \Big[(-\nabla^2\dot{\phi})\,\delta\phi + \dot{\tilde{\eta}}\,\delta\,(\tilde{\eta} - \mu\,\theta)\Big] \tag{121}$$

The combination $\tilde{\eta} - \mu\,\theta$, which is gauge-invariant, will be denoted by ξ. From (121), $\dot{\tilde{\eta}}$ is conjugate to ξ.

The Hamiltonian corresponding to the action (118) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} &= \frac{1}{2}\int d^2x \ \Big[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 + (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 + (\nabla\dot{\theta})^2 + (\dot{\tilde{\eta}})^2 + (\nabla\xi)^2 + \mu^2(\nabla\phi)^2\Big] \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\int \Big[(\nabla\dot{\phi})^2 + (-\nabla^2\phi)^2 - \mu^2\dot{\tilde{\eta}}\,G\,\dot{\tilde{\eta}} + (\dot{\tilde{\eta}})^2 + (\nabla\xi)^2 + \mu^2(\nabla\phi)^2\Big]\end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

where G is the Green's function for ∇^2. Now define

$$\varphi = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\ \phi, \qquad \dot{\tilde{\eta}} = \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\ \chi \tag{123}$$

Then we can write

$$\mathcal{A} = \int d^2x \ \Big[\dot{\varphi}\,\delta\varphi + \chi\,\delta(\sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\xi)\Big] \tag{124}$$

This leads to the representation

$$\dot{\varphi} = -i\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi}, \qquad \sqrt{-\nabla^2}\,\xi = i\frac{\delta}{\delta\chi} \tag{125}$$

The Hamiltonian is then

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{2}\int d^2x\ \left[-\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi^2} + (\nabla\varphi)^2 + \mu^2\varphi^2 - \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\chi^2} + (\nabla\chi)^2 + \mu^2\chi^2\right] \tag{126}$$

This shows again that the degrees of freedom correspond to two scalar fields. We have already introduced the nonlocal combinations needed to render the commutation rules local, so that one can proceed to the ground state wave function and formulate the entanglement entropy in terms of integrating out fields in some subdomain of the two-dimensional space. The resulting EE is simply twice the amount for a single scalar, i.e., twice the amount in (8).

Going back to the action (110), notice that if we eliminate $\tilde{\eta}$ by its equation of motion, or by integrating it out in the functional integral, we get a nonlocal mass term for the gauge field. In terms of wave functions and Hamiltonians, this procedure is equivalent to integrating over the vacuum wave function for the $\tilde{\eta}$ degrees of freedom. One may thus consider the entanglement entropy by defining a reduced density matrix

$$\rho_{red}(\varphi_{\rm II}, \varphi'_{\rm II}) = \int [d\varphi_{\rm I}\, d\chi]\ \Psi[\varphi_{\rm I}, \varphi_{\rm II}, \chi]\, \Psi^*[\varphi_{\rm I}, \varphi'_{\rm II}, \chi] \tag{127}$$

where we identify φ for region I, and identify the χ fields over all of space. Since from (126), the wave functions for φ and χ separate, the resultant EE is expected to be that of a single scalar field, as in (8).

To understand the nature of the nonlocal mass term for the gauge field induced by the Higgs mechanism more concretely, consider the first expression for $\mathcal{H}$ given in (122). Expressed in terms of the original gauge potential and electric fields, the Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \int \frac{1}{2}\left[E^2 + B^2 + \mu^2 A_i\left(\delta^{ij} - \frac{\partial_i\partial_j}{\nabla^2}\right)A_j + (\dot{\tilde{\eta}})^2 + (\nabla\xi)^2\right] \tag{128}$$

along with the constraint (117). This shows us that the mass term for φ is nothing but a nonlocal parity conserving mass term given by $\int \frac{\mu^2}{2} A_i\left(\delta^{ij} - \frac{\partial_i\partial_j}{\nabla^2}\right)A_j$. In the Higgsed theory the Gauss law constraint couples the $\tilde{\eta}$ field to φ. Implementation of the Gauss law constraint then renders the $\tilde{\eta}$ field massive as well, leading to the two massive scalars in (126).

In passing, it is worth remarking that one could also consider deforming the Maxwell Hamiltonian by hand by the addition of the mass term and consider the theory given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \int \frac{1}{2}\left[E^2 + B^2 + \mu^2 A_i\left(\delta^{ij} - \frac{\partial_i\partial_j}{\nabla^2}\right)A_j\right] \tag{129}$$

along with the Gauss law constraint $\nabla_i E_i = 0$ [5]. The vacuum wave functional for this theory can be computed by going to the θ, φ variables as before leading to

$$\Psi = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int \varphi(x)\sqrt{-\partial_i\partial_i + \mu^2}\ \varphi(x)} \tag{130}$$

[5]The nonabelian completion of this mass term arises naturally as a dynamically generated term in the nonabelian theory [17].

The entanglement entropy obtained from this wave functional is obviously the same as that of a massive scalar field.

At the level of the action, the elimination of the Higgs field leads to the covariant analog of the mass term, namely, $\frac{\mu^2}{2}\int A_\mu \left(\delta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{\partial^\mu\partial^\nu}{\Box}\right) A_\nu$. The direct Hamiltonian analysis of this is nontrivial since it involves terms which are nonlocal in time. Effectively the Hamiltonian formulation amounts to the elimination of the χ-field as in (127) and leads to the massive wave functional given above [18].

4 Yang-Mills Theory

The strategy for computing the entanglement entropy - illustrated above for the abelian theory - can be generalized to the nonabelian case using the approach of Karabali, Kim and Nair (KKN) to gluodynamics [10]. Of course, we do not expect to compute this quantity exactly in the case of the interacting nonabelian theory and will have to restrict our analytical computation to the "free theory" limit. But, as we illustrate below the $free$ limit of the gauge invariant version of the theory differs radically from the naive $free$ limit. The former encodes crucial information about the nonperturbative mass gap in the confining theory. The free gauge invariant theory thus allows us to probe the effect of the nonperturbative mass gap on the EE from first principles within a Hamiltonian framework. We shall refer to [10] for the relevant technical details, capturing only what is relevant for the computation of EE below.
The nonabelian analog of the field χ are $SL(N,\mathbb{C})$-valued complex matrices M and $M^\dagger$ which are used to parametrize the gauge fields as

$$A = -\partial M M^{-1}, \quad \bar{A} = M^{\dagger -1}\bar{\partial} M^\dagger \tag{131}$$

$A_0 = 0$ and under time independent gauge transformations, $M \to UM$. The Hermitian $H = M^\dagger M$, $\in SL(N,\mathbb{C})/SU(N)$ provides a coordinatization of the space of gauge-invariant configurations $\mathcal{C}$ and can be regarded as the basic gauge invariant observable (the nonabelian analog of ϕ). The measure on the configuration space is given by [10]

$$d\mu_C = d\mu[H]\; e^{2\,c_A\,S_{WZW}[H]} \tag{132}$$

where $d\mu[H]$ is the Haar measure on the space of hermitian matrices H and

$$S_{WZW}[H] = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int \mathrm{tr}(\partial H\bar{\partial}H^{-1}) + \frac{i}{12\pi}\int \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma}\mathrm{tr}(H^{-1}\partial_\alpha H H^{-1}\partial_\beta H H^{-1}\partial_\gamma H) \tag{133}$$

is the Wess-Zumino-Witten (WZW) action for the field H. Also c_A in (132) is the adjoint Casimir of the group, equal to N for $SU(N)$. As shown in [10], the S_{WZW} factor arises from the Jacobian for change of variables from $A, \bar{A}$ to H. The Yang-Mills Hamiltonian can be rewritten in terms of the gauge invariant variable H, or more conveniently in terms of the currrent $J = \frac{c_A}{\pi}\partial H H^{-1}$.

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{e^2 c_A}{2\pi}\left(\int J^a \frac{\delta}{\delta J^a} + \int \Omega^{ab}(x,y)\frac{\delta}{\delta J^a(x)}\frac{\delta}{\delta J^b(y)}\right) + \frac{2\pi^2}{e^2 c_A^2}\int (\bar{\partial}J^a\bar{\partial}J^a) \tag{134}$$

where

$$\Omega^{ab}(x,y) = [\mathcal{D}_x \bar{\mathcal{G}}(y,x)]^{ab}, \qquad \mathcal{D}_x = \frac{c_A}{\pi}\partial_x \delta^{ab} + i f^{abc} J^c(x) \tag{135}$$

The Hamiltonian involves the covariant Green's function $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ and hence needs to be defined with appropriate regulators in place. We refer to the original papers [10] for these and other technical issues. For our purposes, it is important to highlight that the first term in the Hamiltonian acts as a mass term when acting on functionals of J. It is this term that renders the theory massive and its coefficient

$$m = \frac{e^2 c_A}{2\pi} \tag{136}$$

is the basic mass gap of the nonabelian theory. Furthermore, (134) is self-adjoint only with respect to the measure (132) and the coefficient of the WZW action is fixed by the requirement of self-adjointness.

While (134) is not known to be exactly solvable, one can compute the ground state wave functional in a strong coupling expansion. This has been carried out in a series of papers, and the resulting string tension compares remarkably well with lattice results [19]. To leading order in the strong coupling expansion, the wave functional is

$$\Psi = \exp\left(-\frac{2\pi^2}{e^2 c_A^2}\int \bar{\partial} J \frac{1}{m + \sqrt{m^2 - \nabla^2}} \bar{\partial} J + \mathcal{O}(J^3)\right) \tag{137}$$

Focusing on just the quadratic part of the wave functional, we can rewrite it in more familiar terms. One can parametrize H as $H = e^{\Phi}$ and absorb the exponential factor involving $S_{WZW}[H]$ in (132) in a redefinition of the wave function. After expanding to quadratic order in Φ^a and redefining $\Phi^a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-\nabla^2}}\varphi^a$, we get

$$\Psi = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\int \varphi^a \sqrt{m^2 - \nabla^2}\varphi^a + \cdots\right) \tag{138}$$

The wave function (137) is square integrable with the integration measure for H given by (132), while the wave function (138) is square-integrable with just the Haar measure $d\mu[H]$. The same manipulations allow us to rewrite the Hamiltonian in terms of its action on (138) as

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\int \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi^a \delta\varphi^a} + \frac{1}{2}\int \varphi^a(-\nabla^2 + m^2)\varphi^a + \cdots \tag{139}$$

The ellipsis refer to cubic and higher order terms in φ. Ignoring the higher order terms, it is clear that (138) is the wave functional for (139) . This quadratic theory is the non-standard $free$ limit of the nonabelian theory we alluded to earlier. In this approximation, the gauge theory decouples into c_A copies of a massive scalar theory. Unlike the case of restricting the action in terms of A_μ to the quadratic level, this truncation is completely gauge invariant. Furthermore, despite being a gaussian theory, it nevertheless has information about the nonperturbative mass gap m which is not visible to any finite order in perturbation theory.

Having reduced the problem to that of c_A copies of a massive scalar, we can borrow from (8) and write the EE for this theory (in the nonstandard *free* limit mentioned above) as

$$S_E = c_A \, \frac{\mathbb{A}}{12\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \frac{e^2 c_A}{2\pi} \sqrt{\pi} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right) \tag{140}$$

A few comments about this result are in order at this point.

1. The first term in (140) corresponds to the EE for c_A copies of the Maxwell theory (35).

2. Apart from the the divergent $1/\epsilon$ term, we see that the three-dimensional entropy also contains a finite negative term $-\frac{\mathbb{A}\, m}{12}$ that is proportional to the mass gap. This is reminiscent of the topological contribution to the entropy in Chern-Simons theories but, unlike the topological term, the contribution from the nonlocal parity preserving mass scales as the area. This result shows a direct link between the finite part of EE and the volume measure on the gauge theory configurations which - in turn - is deeply connected to IR properties of the theory. Specifically, we note that m is renormalized in the presence of an explicit or induced Chern-Simons term by a finite amount [20],

$$m \to m + \frac{e^2 k}{4\pi} \tag{141}$$

   where k is the Chern-Simons level number. In theories with extended supersymmetry, the induced level number exactly cancels m and the mass gap is renormalized to zero [21]. (This is required by supersymmetry.) The finite term in (140) will thus be absent in such theories which are also known to be non-confining. This observation is meant to illustrate a putative link between the finite terms in the EE and IR properties of gauge theories.

3. This calculation of EE using the gauge-invariant wave function as a starting point did not lead to a contact term in three dimensions. Thus the partition function for the gauge theory on a cone and the present procedure of first obtaining a wave function in terms of a gauge-invariant variable and then calculating the EE yield slightly different results. This may not be all that surprising since there is no reason to expect that the two procedures are calculating the same quantity. Nevertheless, it is worth investigating how these differences can arise. We will comment on this below.

5 The cone partition function and the contact term

The ground state wave functional at a fixed time, say at $t = 0$, can be obtained as the functional integral of e^{-S}, where S is the Euclidean action, over all fields for all $t < 0$ with specified fixed values at $t = 0$. For the Maxwell field, we can use the BRST gauge-fixed Euclidean action

$$S \;=\; \frac{1}{4} \int F_{\mu\nu} \, F^{\mu\nu} \;+\; S_{gf}$$

$$S_{gf} \;=\; Q\int \bar{c}\left(\partial\cdot A - i\frac{N}{2}\right) = \int i\,N\,\partial\cdot A + \frac{N^2}{2} + \bar{c}(-\Box)c \tag{142}$$

with the BRST transformations as given in (111), dropping $\tilde{\eta}$ and its transformation. The wave function may thus be written as

$$\Psi[\tilde{A}_\mu] = \int \mathcal{D}[A,c,\bar{c}]\;\delta(A_\mu(x_i,t=0) - \tilde{A}_\mu(x_i))\;e^{-S} \tag{143}$$

If we apply the replica trick directly to this expression (143), the EE would still be given by (4), but W_α would now be given by [7]

$$W_\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{tr}\ln(g^{\mu\nu}(-\Box) - R^{\mu\nu}) - \mathrm{tr}\ln(-\Box) \tag{144}$$

The first term is the gauge field contribution, while the second term arises from the ghost fields. The functional determinants above are to be evaluated on the cone and the curvature term $R^{\mu\nu}$ represents a delta function contribution from the tip of the cone. Using the same techniques used in [7], one can obtain the following expression for the EE as derived from (144),

$$S_E^{cone} = (d-2)S_E(m=0) + S_E^{contact} \tag{145}$$

The last term in this equation, the so-called contact term, is given by

$$S_E^{contact} = -\frac{\mathbb{A}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\right) \tag{146}$$

The expression for EE in (145) deviates from the expression obtained from the massless limit of (7) due to the contact term contribution. To better understand this additional contribution it is useful to deconstruct the evaluation of (144), which is expressed in terms of the vector heat kernel

$$K_V(s,x,y)_{\mu\nu} = \sum_n e^{-\lambda_n s} A_{n\mu}(x)A_{n\nu}(y) \tag{147}$$

Denoting the Lorentz indices along the cone (whose tip lies at the entangling surface) by a, b, the vector fields along those directions satisfy

$$(-g_{ab}\nabla^2 + R_{ab})A_n^b = \lambda_n A_{na} \tag{148}$$

These modes can be constructed from eigenfunctions of the scalar Laplacian ϕ_n. Specifically, the longitudinal and transverse components of A_a are given by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\nabla_a\phi_n, \qquad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_n}}\epsilon_{ab}\nabla^b\phi_n \tag{149}$$

respectively [7]. The direction transverse to the cone has no curvature contributions and the gauge field along that direction simply contributes one scalar degree of freedom to the partition function. After tracing over the a, b indices, the heat kernel along the cone becomes [7, 8]

$$K_V(s,x,x) = \sum_n e^{-\lambda_n s}\,\frac{1}{\lambda_n}\,2\,(\nabla_a\phi_n\nabla^a\phi_n) = 2K(s,x,x) + \underline{\int_s^\infty ds'\nabla^2 K(s',x,x)} \tag{150}$$

In the second expression, we have carried out an integration by parts (and $K(s)$ denotes the scalar heat kernel as before). The additional underlined term generates the contact contribution (146). Adding the scalar contribution from the direction transverse to the cone and those of the ghost fields, the above expression reproduces Kabat's result [7] given in (145). We are now in a position to underscore our key observation regarding the contact term. Evaluating the trace of the α-th power of the reduced density matrix of a gauge theory, i.e., $\mathrm{tr}\rho_{red}^{\alpha}$, involves three operations:

- Computing the wave functional.
- Solving the constraints due to gauge invariance and Gauss law.
- Expressing $\mathrm{tr}\rho_{red}^{\alpha}$ as a functional integral on a cone.

In our gauge invariant approach, we first computed the wave functional using a gauge invariant Hamiltonian framework (138) and expressed the wave functional in terms of the gauge invariant scalar degrees of freedom in flat space. The EE is then computed by applying the replica trick at this stage. In other words, we are applying the replica trick $after$ reduction via the Gauss law constraints. The resulting EE (8) agrees with that of a single scalar in three spacetime dimensions.

In the computation outlined in this section, we start with the wave-functional (143) which is still expressed in terms of the A_μ. One then applies the replica trick to this wave functional (i.e. *before* reduction) to write down a functional integral on the cone. Reduction to gauge invariant variables may be carried out, but this is done on the cone. This effectively reverses the order of the second and third operations mentioned above and the difference is the contact term.

The two procedures are inequivalent and may be viewed as giving different definitions of entropy.

We thank Daniel Kabat for many useful comments and discussions. This research was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation grants PHY-1417562, PHY-1519449 and by PSC-CUNY awards.

References

[1] L. Bombelli, R. K. Koul, J. Lee and R. D. Sorkin, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 373 (1986), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.34.373; M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 666 (1993), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.71.666 [hep-th/9303048].

[2] W. Donnelly, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 085004 (2012), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.085004 [arXiv:1109.0036 [hep-th]]; H. Casini, M. Huerta and J. A. Rosabal, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.

8, 085012 (2014), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.085012 [arXiv:1312.1183 [hep-th]]; R. M. Soni and S. P. Trivedi, arXiv:1608.00353 [hep-th].

[3] H. Casini and M. Huerta, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 10, 105013 (2014), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.105013 [arXiv:1406.2991 [hep-th]].

[4] C. G. Callan, Jr. and F. Wilczek, Phys. Lett. B **333**, 55 (1994), doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)91007-3 [hep-th/9401072]; M. P. Hertzberg and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 050404 (2011), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.050404 [arXiv:1007.0993 [hep-th]].

[5] S. N. Solodukhin, "Entanglement entropy of black holes," Living Rev. Rel. **14**, 8 (2011), [arXiv:1104.3712 [hep-th]]; H. Casini and M. Huerta, J. Phys. A **42**, 504007 (2009) [arXiv:0905.2562 [hep-th]]; P. Calabrese and J. Cardy, J. Phys. A **42**, 504005 (2009), doi:10.1088/1751-8113/42/50/504005 [arXiv:0905.4013 [cond-mat.stat-mech]]; K. W. Huang, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 025010 (2015), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.025010 [arXiv:1412.2730 [hep-th]].

[6] C. A. Agon, M. Headrick, D. L. Jafferis and S. Kasko, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 025018 (2014), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.025018 [arXiv:1310.4886 [hep-th]]; H. J. Schnitzer, arXiv:1611.03116 [hep-th].

[7] D. N. Kabat, Nucl. Phys. B **453**, 281 (1995), doi:10.1016/0550-3213(95)00443-V [hep-th/9503016].

[8] W. Donnelly and A. C. Wall, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, no. 11, 111603 (2015), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.111603 [arXiv:1412.1895 [hep-th]]; W. Donnelly and A. C. Wall, arXiv:1506.05792 [hep-th].

[9] H. Casini and M. Huerta, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 10, 105031 (2016), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.105031 [arXiv:1512.06182 [hep-th]].

[10] D. Karabali and V. P. Nair, Nucl. Phys. B **464**, 135 (1996) [hep-th/9510157]; D. Karabali and V. P. Nair, Phys. Lett. B **379**, 141 (1996) [hep-th/9602155]; D. Karabali, C. J. Kim and V. P. Nair, Nucl. Phys. B **524**, 661 (1998) [hep-th/9705087].

[11] A. P. Balachandran, L. Chandar, E. Ercolessi, T. R. Govindarajan and R. Shankar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **9**, 3417 (1994). doi:10.1142/S0217751X94001357, arXiv:cond-mat/9309051; A. P. Balachandran, L. Chandar and A. Momen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **12**, 625 (1997), doi:10.1142/S0217751X97000578 [hep-th/9512047]; M. Asorey, A. P. Balachandran and J. M. Perez-Pardo, Rev. Math. Phys. **28**, no. 09, 1650020 (2016), doi:10.1142/S0129055X16500203 [arXiv:1505.03461 [math-ph]].

[12] D. Kabat, D. Karabali and V. P. Nair, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 125013 (2010); [Phys. Rev. D **84**, 129901 (2011)] [arXiv:1002.3575 [hep-th]].

[13] J. Cano, T. L. Hughes and M. Mulligan, Phys. Rev. B **92**, no. 7, 075104 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.92.075104 [arXiv:1411.5369 [cond-mat.str-el]]; S. Furukawa and Y. B. Kim, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 085112 (2011); Erratum: [Phys. Rev. B **87**, no. 11, 119901 (2013)], doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.87.119901, 10.1103/PhysRevB.83.085112 [arXiv:1009.3016 [cond-mat.str-el]]; R. Lundgren, Y. Fuji, S. Furukawa and M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. B **88**, no. 24, 245137 (2013); Erratum: [Phys. Rev. B **92**, no. 3, 039903 (2015)], doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.92.039903, 10.1103/PhysRevB.88.245137

[14] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110404 (2006), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.110404 [hep-th/0510092]; M. Levin and X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110405 (2006), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.110405

[15] X. Wen, S. Matsuura and S. Ryu, Phys. Rev. B **93**, no. 24, 245140 (2016), doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.93.245140 [arXiv:1603.08534 [cond-mat.mes-hall]].

[16] S. Dong, E. Fradkin, R. G. Leigh and S. Nowling, JHEP **0805**, 016 (2008), doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/05/016 [arXiv:0802.3231 [hep-th]].

[17] G. Alexanian and V. P. Nair, Phys. Lett. B **352**, 435 (1995), doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)00475-Z [hep-ph/9504256].

[18] V. P. Nair, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 105019 (2012), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.105019 [arXiv:1109.6376 [hep-th]].

[19] D. Karabali, C. J. Kim and V. P. Nair, Phys. Lett. B **434**, 103 (1998), doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(98)00751-5 [hep-th/9804132]; D. Karabali, V. P. Nair and A. Yelnikov, Nucl. Phys. B **824**, 387 (2010), doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2009.07.019 [arXiv:0906.0783 [hep-th]].

[20] D. Karabali, C. J. Kim and V. P. Nair, Nucl. Phys. B **566**, 331 (2000), doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00701-4 [hep-th/9907078]; A. Agarwal and V. P. Nair, J. Phys. A **48**, no. 46, 465401 (2015), doi:10.1088/1751-8113/48/46/465401 [arXiv:1504.07201 [hep-th]].

[21] A. Agarwal and V. P. Nair, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 085011 (2012), doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.085011 [arXiv:1201.6609 [hep-th]].